

**In the United States Court of Federal Claims**  
**OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS**

No. 03-1680V

Filed: February 27, 2006

\*\*\*\*\*

JOHN ANDREW STOKES, and BETH STOKES, \*  
on behalf of, as parents of and next friends to \*  
KRISTEN APRIL STOKES, a minor, \*

Petitioners,

UNPUBLISHED

v.

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF \*  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, \*

Respondent. \*

\*\*\*\*\*

**ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS DECISION**<sup>1</sup>

On January 23, 2006, petitioners' counsel filed petitioners' Petition for Fees and Costs in compliance with General Order #9. On January 31, 2006, respondent's counsel orally informed the court that respondent does not object to petitioner's request of \$37,905.00 in attorney's fees and \$3,727.38 in costs. Accordingly, the court finds that an award of **\$37,905.00 in fees and \$3,727.38 in costs** is appropriate. The award shall be made payable jointly to petitioner and his attorney.

The clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.<sup>2</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary J. Golkiewicz  
Chief Special Master

<sup>1</sup>The undersigned intends to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (Dec. 17, 2002). As provided by Vaccine Rule 18(b), each party has 14 days within which to request redaction "of any information furnished by that party (1) that is trade secret or commercial or financial information and is privileged or confidential, or (2) that are medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy." Vaccine Rule 18(b). Otherwise, "the entire" decision will be available to the public. Id.

<sup>2</sup>This amount is intended to cover all legal expenses. This award encompasses all charges by the attorney against a client, "advanced costs" as well as fees for legal services rendered. Furthermore, 42 U.S.C.A. §300aa-15(e)(3) prevents an attorney from charging or collecting fees (including costs) which would be in addition to the amount awarded herein. See generally, Beck v. Secretary of HHS, 924 F.2d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 1991).